

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of August 17, 2009 in which claims 1-10, 12-20, 22-29 and 31-38 were rejected and claims 11, 21 and 30 objected to.

Amendments

Claims 1, 18 and 22 have been amended to specify “internet protocol datacast” in place of “digital broadcast.” Support can be found in the application as originally filed in the description on page 7, line 10.

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to specify “the device adapted to convey signals unidirectionally from the interface to the mobile terminal.” Claim 22 has been amended in a similar way. Support can be found in the application as originally filed, for example, on page 7, line 32 to page 8, line 3 and in Figure 3, and also in Figures 5 to 11.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

On page 2, line 17 to page 3, line 3, the Examiner disagrees with some of Applicants' arguments filed on 8 May 2009. On page 5, line 7 to page 6, lines 10, the Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Friesen* (US 6,892,080) in view of *Tendler* (US 2002/0068549) and further in view of *Hwangbo* (US 2003/0192061).

However, Applicants consider that the Examiner may have misunderstood or overlooked some of Applicants' arguments and so present these arguments again below, together with additional comments.

Firstly, the Examiner considers that the person of ordinary skill would modify *Friesen* in view of *Tendler* so as to arrive at a device which uses inductive coupling for a GPS connection.

However, Applicants disagree.

Applicants consider that, if the person of ordinary skill were to modify *Friesen* in view of *Tendler*, they would arrive at a device which uses RF coupling for a GPS connection.

This is because *Tendler* merely describes a passive transfer antenna to couple relatively weak GPS signals from an active GPS antenna mounted outside a car to an internally carried GPS antenna in a phone (see paragraph [0010]). In other words, *Tendler* teaches using RF coupling for conveying a GPS signal.

Furthermore, *Tendler* teaches different types of connections for cellular communication and GPS signals (see Figure 1). Thus, *Tendler* does not suggest using a cellular communication connection for GPS signals.

Moreover, the person of ordinary skill would be dissuaded from using inductive coupling for conveying a GPS signal since the person would foresee that, in order to do so effectively, the person would have to modify the cellular phone of *Tendler*, for example by replacing the active patch antenna with an alternative antenna. However, this may increase complexity and costs and adversely affect reception of GPS signals by the cellular phone when not in the handsfree cradle. In any case, none of the references suggest any way of carrying out such a modification and would be nonenabling for such a purpose.

The Examiner considers that column 44, lines 23 to 50 of *Friesen*, which mentions inductive coupling, inherently discloses a loop or coil configured to couple inductively with a corresponding loop or coil included in a mobile terminal.

However, Applicants disagree.

Applicants consider that *Friesen* does not clearly and unambiguously disclose a loop or coil, let alone corresponding loops or coils as specified in claim 1. For example, antennas can be inductively coupled to one another by placing them sufficiently close together. Moreover, there is no mention in *Friesen* of corresponding, or similar, loops or coils such as those illustrated in Figure 4 of the present application.

The Examiner considers that the person of ordinary skill would consider modifying *Friesen* and *Tendler* in view of *Hwangbo*.

However, Applicants disagree.

Applicants note that the Examiner has not responded to Applicants' arguments filed on 8 May 2009.

Applicants considered then and still consider now that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not consider modifying *Friesen* and *Tendler* in view of

Hwangbo because the references are concerned with completely different problems and describe very different systems from one another. *Hwangbo* is concerned with providing a set-top box system for viewing different digital broadcast programs (see paragraph [0008]) whereas *Friesen* concerns providing a booster amplifier that enhances the performance of a cellular telephone while operating a motor vehicle (see column 3, lines 14 to 16).

To expedite prosecution, however, claim 1 has been amended without prejudice to specify that the interface adapted to receive a signal is adapted to receive a signal carrying an internet protocol datacast. Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended without prejudice to specify that the device is adapted to convey signals unidirectionally from the interface to the mobile terminal.

Applicants consider that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose these features. For at least these reasons, Applicants consider that claim 1 is not obvious over *Friesen* in view of *Tendler* and further in view of *Hwangbo*.

Applicants consider that claims 18 and 22 are not obvious for the same reasons as claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants consider that claims 2 to 17, 19 to 21 and 23 to 33 are not obvious at least by way of dependency. Thus, Applicants consider that the Examiner's arguments regarding these claims are moot and need not be addressed. It should be realized that by not addressing these arguments, it is not admitted that they are correct.

For example, claim 5 recites an amplifier adapted to amplify the signal and adapted to intermittently operate under control of the mobile terminal.

The Examiner considers that this feature is disclosed in *Friesen* in Figure 2, column 6, lines 11 to 38 and column 7, lines 20 to 37. However, Applicants consider that *Friesen* does not disclose this feature.

Friesen merely describes that an amplifier can detect the power of the signal which it is amplifying and adjust a gain accordingly. However, in the presently claimed subject matter, a signal is transmitted unidirectionally from the device to the mobile terminal, i.e., not from the mobile terminal to the device and, thus, the control method described in *Friesen* cannot be used. In the claimed invention, other

means are provided such as, for example, a switched power supply connection (see page 12, lines 17 to 22). However, there is no mention in *Friesen* or any of the other references of such a control means.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of August 17, 2009, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-38 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Francis J. Maguire". The signature is stylized with a large, looped 'F' and a cursive 'Maguire'.

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/lk
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234